

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. The Examiner has objected to Claims 4-8 as being dependent upon a rejected base Claim 1, but these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 has been objected to.

Regarding the rejection to Claim 3, the Examiner maintains that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “third key array” in line 2, as neither a first nor a second key array is recited in the base claim. Claims 3 and 9 have been amended to address the Examiner’s objection. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the objection of Claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki et al. (EP 1,207,671). Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Kuroda (U.S. Pub. 2004/0048632) and Pallakoff (U.S. Pub. 2002/0163504).

Ozaki teaches an opening/closing structure for a portable information terminal. The Examiner asserts that Ozaki teaches each and every element of independent Claim 1. However, Ozaki does not provide “a step compensating mechanism *for preventing* a step between the top surface of the body housing and the top surface of the swing housing when the swing housing is rotated to the prescribed angle from the body housing.” [Emphasis added], as recited in Claim 1. While Ozaki does teach an opening and closing structure for a portable terminal, it does not describe a problem with key manipulation or aesthetics associated with a step between the body and the swing housing when the device is open, thereby failing to state a reason for preventing a step between the body housing and the swing housing sections. Further, Ozaki, does not provide a “mechanism for preventing a step” because as shown in Figs. 1B, 2A and 6C of Ozaki, a step remains between the face of the display portion 3 and the face of the operating portion 5.

As Ozaki does not teach each and every element of Claim 1, Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Ozaki, and is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, because Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1, Claims 2-9 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely 1-9 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over the printed name.

Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516